



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

HC

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/988,439 12/11/97 GONG

L 3070009

020277
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY
600 13TH STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3096

LM01/0216

EXAMINER

BADERMAN, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2785

10

DATE MAILED: 02/16/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/988,439

Applicant

Gong

Examiner
Scott T. Baderman

Group Art Unit
2785



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 24, 1999

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2785

Examiner: Scott T. Baderman

United States Department of Commerce

Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231



DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1, 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Atsatt et al. (5,758,153).

This rejection is being applied for the same reasons set forth in the previous Office action, paper number 8, paragraph 3, mailed August 25, 1999.

Art Unit: 2785

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 2-9, 11-18 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atsatt et al..

This rejection is being applied for the same reasons set forth in the previous Office action, paper number 8, paragraph 5, mailed August 25, 1999.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed November 24, 1999 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claims 1, 10 and 19, the Applicant argues that the difference between Atsatt (5,758,153) and the claimed invention is that, in the claimed invention, protection domains are associated with classes of objects, and in Atsatt, protection domains are associated with users (which are internally represented by objects that are instances of the class TCredentials). The Applicant further argues that Atsatt does not describe or in any way suggest a system that associates protection domains and object classes. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, the

Art Unit: 2785

Examiner reminds that Applicant that all claims are given their broadest possible interpretation so long as the interpretation does not deviate from the invention. The limitation of argument, with respect to claims 1, 10 and 19, is "establishing an association between said one or more protection domains and one or more classes of one or more objects, and further, determining whether an action requested by an object is permitted based on this association." As taught by Atsatt, and also noted by the Applicant in his arguments, users are represented as objects which are instances of a class. When a user attempts to perform an action, the user's access rights are first determined by comparing them with the data in an access control list (ACL). This ACL is used to implement protection domains. All of the above is taught by Atsatt, generally, in column 12: lines 21-43. The examiner asserts that, based on the above comments, the system and method taught by Atsatt reads on the claims that are currently presented. To be more specific, Atsatt does establish a protection domain which includes permissions (column 12: lines 34-35). Atsatt does establish an association between the protection domain and a class of objects (in this case the TCredentials class) (column 12: lines 25-34). And last, Atsatt does determine whether an action requested by the user (i.e., object) is permitted based on the association between the protection domain (using the rights therein) and the class which represents the user (i.e., the user's access rights) (column 12: lines 29-40). Regardless of the Applicant's comments that Atsatt is a different workable security system as that which is claimed, the Examiner asserts that the current claim language does not overcome the teachings of Atsatt.

Art Unit: 2785

With respect to claims 2-9, 11-18 and 20-24, the Applicant only argues that Atsatt does not teach these claim's respective limitations and does not argue why they are not obvious. Thus, the Examiner deems these arguments moot.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott T. Baderman whose telephone number is (703) 305-4644.

Art Unit: 2785

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE")

Or:

(703) 305-3718 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA,
Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

STB

February 8, 2000


ROBERT W. BEAUSOLIEL, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700